STRATEGIC PLANNING ADVISORY COMMITTEE
October 12, 2010
Conference Room, Student Union

The meeting was called to order at 3:05 p.m. with the following people present: Brad Chambers, Peggy Clark, Richard Coughlin, Doug Davenport, Lou Ann Gilchrist, Deb Kerby, Donna Liss, and Clifton Ricana. Guest speakers Jon Gering, Dave Rector, and Marty Eisenberg arrived at their respective scheduled times.

Sustainability Committee—Jon Gering
Jon distributed the handouts "Truman State University Sustainability Initiative" and "Sustainability Action Committee—Information for the Strategic Planning Committee". These are important trends or shifts that will take place. Jon would like to see the University participate in the assessment of the three sustainability components--social, economic, and environmental. Truman is a member of the Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education, which provides STARS (Sustainability Tracking, Assessment & Rating System) certification. We have to benchmark 96 measures of various items. In October, Truman will submit the report which we have been working on for 1.5 years.

The Sustainability Action Committee will be submitting an annual report to the President. The subcommittees and external liaisons are currently being formed. Lou Ann told Jon if there is anything else he would like to share with the Committee, to pass it along to her.

State Funding—Dave Rector
Dave distributed two handouts, "Tuition and State Appropriations" and "Total E&G Budgets". These show the actual funding for the past several years and expectations for the next five years. There are rough prospects for the future.

Truman cannot raise tuition more than the CPI. Following previous dips in appropriations, larger increases in tuition charges followed. In 2012, we are expecting a 15% decrease in funding. From 2013-2015, it is anticipated that the economy will turn around. The prediction for inflation next year is about 1%. The other chart shows past E&G funding, along with anticipated funding assumptions, which was then projected into future anticipated E&G funding. The projected unemployment rate in Missouri will be at 8% during the fourth quarter of 2011, with inflation of 1% through 2011. The Missouri general revenue sources are 91% from individual income and sales taxes.

The funding formula may be bit of good news as no formula has been used the last few years, only a percentage decrease. The legislature looks at outcomes, retention rates, graduation rates, and degrees granted in economic development areas.

Dave is on another funding formula committee, and will try to keep the formula based on performance rather than enrollment. Truman's goal is to educate traditional students, and our appropriation per student is very good compared to other schools. There are six state universities and three community colleges in the two-county-wide corridor on the west side of the state.

Troy is trying to build alliances with other campuses. They realize that Truman does perform. Degrees in sciences and mathematics are important. State aid (scholarship) programs like Bright Flight and Access Missouri have been cut and probably won't be restored. The Governor is under a constitutional mandate to balance the budget. MOREnet and MOBIUS funding was cut to $0, and Truman is now picking up those costs.

Lou Ann told Dave if there is anything else he would like the Committee to know, to please pass it along. What things are we doing now that cost money and that we can quit doing and still keep the mission and quality?

<u>Economic Trends for Access to Higher Education—Marty Eisenberg</u>
Marty shared some things he learned last year that may be relevant. He attended the American Council on Education's Leadership Program, which was based on issues in Higher Ed. Some of the issues higher education faces over the next twenty years include:

1) Faculty issues—where will the next generation of faculty come from with the coming wave of retirements? There are also questions about adjuncts, aging faculty, and where our future leaders will come from. There will be massive shifts.

2) Access/completion/retention/graduation issues—the debate will still continue to be merit-based aid versus need-based aid, which has tripled over the last ten years. There has been a dramatic shift and the Federal share is swamping the state share, which will also mean increased regulations and what strings are attached. The states used to provide the biggest share of financial aid. The federal share has almost tripled in the last ten years, and includes Pell Grants, earmarks, construction, and research programs.

3) Quality control—which comes into accountability and assessment. How do we sustain quality within the system? It is not clear that the traditional system of accreditation will survive the next reauthorization of the Higher Ed act. The HLC has already been recommended to lose its ability to be an accreditor for some of the past decisions it has made.

The Obama push in education is to raise college completion rates. We will have to do things with non-traditional students in order to meet the goals, which include issues of access and financing. National trends show increasingly first-generation students who are poorer, which means that they will have different needs. These will include expenses of remediation and the blending of K-12.

The biggest and most subtle change is that the fundamental economic models of education are changing dramatically. The challenge to the financial model is that community colleges distribute the costs differently. They typically have small classes, but only do the first two years. At state universities, they may have large lecture classes the first two years, and small classes for upper-level courses. This may change the pricing models, how things are being delivered, and the cross subsidies.

The residential component has to be included, as immersion is a big part of the college experience. Terry Hartle, with the American Council on Education, states that over the last 20 years nothing has increased in cost nearly as much as higher education. The economic return for a college degree may not be worth the amount of debt students are accruing. How much debt do we want a student leaving Truman with?

4) National debate--what really predicts success in college and what variables should we be looking at? High school grades may be more valuable in predicting college performance than test scores. It is better to put students in the most challenging institution they can get into. The Truman Experience also includes throwing bright highly-motivated students together with other high-achieving students.

5) The face of America is changing. Are we more prepared for a diverse student body? Are we producing that next generation of faculty and higher education leaders?

Goals to think about:

1) We need to articulate the value of the residential component and be able to document it.

2) We need to talk about the aspects of the classroom experience that can't be done online.

3) We need to be able to explain what the broad, long-term value of an educational experience is to future students and their parents.

4) We also need to look at how to broaden the success rate of students, and build the success structures to do it. This may include our commitment to national tests and what those mean. Can we find more students that have good grades in high school that may not have as great test scores who may do well?

We need to do small things that will make a big difference long term.

Lou Ann told Marty if he thinks of anything else the Committee needs to know, to please pass it along.

Lou Ann asked presenters to try to keep their reports to half an hour. They should provide a quick picture, which needs to be clearly articulated. Paul and Donna are scheduled next week. Another Faculty Forum is scheduled for tomorrow afternoon.

The meeting closed at 4:35 p.m.